

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 93 13:08:04 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #179
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Wed, 9 Jun 93 Volume 93 : Issue 179

Today's Topics:

Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(
Blind VE's, Clarification 2
Blind VE's: Suggestions and Responses
blind VEs (3 msgs)
VE's Unnecessary?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 14:26:46 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!apollo.hp.com!hpwin052!hpqmoea!dstock@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

It sounds like your FCC has lost sight of its actual needs (a
specially mixed metaphor tailored to the subject in hand :-)

I believe that there are several VE functions:

- 1) To put an exam together from the question pool
- 2) To supervise the examination
- 3) To mark the papers submitted
- 4) To send the morse test

5) To examine the copy/ ask questions on the copy.

To assemble an exam needs some knowledge of the field to get a reasonable set of questions and avoid the risk of concentration in some areas.

To supervise an exam successfully, there must be at least a pair of sharp eyes, a pair of acute ears and a suspicious mind in the room. How many warm bodies these are distributed over is irrelevant as long as these people can communicate effectively.

In Britain, the multiple choice exam is answered on a machine-readable card, so marking requires no human intervention (If anyone could give a good reason why results aren't given for 3 months after the exam, I'd be grateful...)

Sending the Morse test is also done by machine by many US examiners, I understand.

Reading someone's copy, possibly in nervous handwriting is probably beyond machines for some time to come, and human inspection would likely always be demanded in cases of failure. Someone has to be able to read it. The ten questions option could be verbal or written.

There is no valid reason for any blanket bans, but the group of examiners must be responsible and capable of, together, getting the job done properly. Any disabilities on the examiners part must not interfere with the proper accomodation of a candidate's abilities.

I agree that the statement that started this whole thing off was a masterpiece of lack-of-thought, but sight does have its uses, and is sometimes necessary. Just who the eyes belong to can be negotiable.

David GM4ZNX

Date: 9 Jun 1993 06:39:40 -0500
From: usc!cs.utexas.edu!geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!sleepy.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Blind VE's, Clarification 2
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Date: 9 Jun 1993 10:29:00 -0500
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!cs.utexas.edu!
geraldo.cc.utexas.edu!thumper.cc.utexas.edu!not-for-mail@ames.arpa
Subject: Blind VE's: Suggestions and Responses
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>|> Brian McMinn n5pss brian.mcminn@amd.com

>

>--

>

>

>As far as amateur testing, I suppose there could be certain disadvantages if
>all three VE's are blind (or deaf or whatever) but the chances of that are
>slim. Even if all three were blind, chances are that they would realize
>any limitations and take actions to compensate. Amateur radio testing is
>not life-or-death - and if someone needs to cheat to get their ticket, they
>will do it one way or another. Eventually it will either catch up with them
>or they will actually learn ham radio. In the scheme of things, it really
>should not be such an issue...

>

>+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer

+

Good for you, Tom!

You've made the point masterfully. As a blind person it's up to me to decide what my limitations are. I have no problem with facing the reality that there are certain things that I simply can not do. But I want the chance to try those things that I feel that I **might** be able to do. If after trying these things I find that I can't do them, then I'll do something else.

As for Brian's suggestion, I can only say that if such a skills test were administered to **everyone**, the blind would I am sure, participate along with everyone else. If the test were given to all it wouldn't be IMHO discriminatory.

But there shouldn't be a need for such a test, just as you've indicated, Tom. All PWD's should be accepted in all facets of the VE program. If certain of them are incapable of doing the job correctly they should be removed.

73,

--
David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNIE) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundum Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: 8 Jun 93 22:01:02 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!fc.hp.com!
perry@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: blind VEs
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ (jbromley@sedona.intel.com) drifts:

: One has to wonder just how far this process of devising
: "alternative techniques to accomplish the tasks of a VE"
: could be taken.

: More particularly, is there any *real* reason why VE's have
: to be licensed amateur radio operators?

Both the FCC droid and the Advanced/Extra VE have an interest in maintaining the integrity of the system.

And now, back to the topic at hand.

Perry Scott
AA0ET

Date: Tue, 08 Jun 93 22:21:08 PDT
From: Carl Schaefer <schaefer@cisco.com>
Subject: blind VEs
To: The Monster of Peladon <aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu>

>> But do not think that we will stand idly by and let the gains
>> that we have so painstakingly obtained for ourselves be taken away
>> because of the apathy or fear of a few.

I re-read the article from KE4ZV that you answered.

I don't believe KE4ZV wasn't speaking from apathy or fear, or that he was arguing to take away any painstakingly obtained gains.

Perhaps it's due to difference in our perspectives, but most of the points in your followup, while valid in general, don't seem to me to precisely address those in KE4ZV's article. As an aside, I believe imprecise consideration and use of language is a major accelerating

factors in flame wars.

>> We have a saying in the
>> organization to which I belong, the National Federation of the
>> Blind: "We do not want strife or confrontation, but we will do what
>> we have to do. We are simply no longer willing to be second class
>> citizens. They say that there is no discrimination, that the blind
>> are not a minority. But we know who we are, and we will never go
>> back." That says it all.

I admire the resolve behind it, but unfortunately it conveys little else which is admirable. The first sentence is a veiled threat of unlimited extent, and the third and fourth sentences are divisive in the extreme ("They" vs. "we"). In the short term this divisiveness may well be useful as a minority group struggles to regain its self-respect. Long term, I believe the oppositional attitude it engenders is a liability, as it continually emphasizes the line between instead of the circle around.

The only real solution is re-education on a societal scale, which obviously is a very slow process. If only willing it to be so were enough!

>> I wanted to make it crystal clear that the
>> discussion that was going on in the thread was not simply idle
>> bantering, and that we fully intend to do what we can to reverse
>> the discriminatory policy of the FCC.

bravo!

>> Perhaps Carl, you saw what I wrote as strident militancy
>> because you are not used to seeing the blind taking charge of their
>> own lives.

completely false. As I read the article I considered the fact that the author claimed to be blind only as I tried to understand his perspective. It is otherwise irrelevant to the article's process of argument and conclusions.

>> You on the other hand have made several about me. The first
>> is that I am a militant.

not exactly; I believe I said that your article displayed militancy. Precision! In my opinion, the calmer, more considered tone of your reply to me is more effective.

>> I intend to share my response to your email with others
>> (Yours will not be shared unless you give me permission to do so,

>> as I respect a person's right to privacy).

go ahead, but for the sake of context please include KE4ZV's article and your followup along with it.

good luck.

Carl

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 06:18:13 -0500 (CDT)
From: The Monster of Peladon <aggedor@sleepy.cc.utexas.edu>
Subject: blind VEs
To: schaefer@cisco.com (Carl Schaefer)

Carl:

Language is important. I've found that it can influence people either way. It can draw allies or it can inspire enemies. As I stated I believe that the article that I responded to displayed a rather standardized brand of paternalism and sarcasm that I have seen far too often, and I responded to him on his own terms.

As for our "We know who we are and we will never go back" saying, it is rooted deep in our history. When that saying was coined in the 1970's, the blind of the nation were virtually under attack from an organization called The National Accreditation Council for Agencies serving the blind and physically handicapped (NAC). This was a private group which accredited (as its name implies) certain agencies involved in work with the blind. Unfortunately the chief prerequisite for accreditation was the amount of money that the agency in question could put into NAC's cauffers. NAC soon became a haven and mouthpiece for the worst of the agencies such as lighthouses for the blind that refused to pay minimum wage. When the blind of America as represented by the National Federation of the Blind protested this action, we were met with nothing short of terrorism.

What sort? How about ransacked NFB offices nationwide? NFB representatives being assaulted on the street? Or how about attorneys being promised monetary compensation for ruining the reputation of NFB leaders. Were this a different setting I would go into more detail concerning this, and doubtless shock you quite a bit.

It was out of that atmosphere that our "we'll never go back" saying grew. We were determined that regardless of the threat, we were going to continue to do what we could to see to it that the blind obtained security, opportunity and equality.

You imply that things have changed to an extent that our saying is no longer needed. You do not know how much I wish that this were true. Unfortunately this isn't the case. Although we finally defeated NAC after a twenty-year struggle, we still have much to do. There are still many people out there who would like to see a return to the days of the quiet, unassuming blind

person who did what he/she was told, and didn't expect to rise above the social status of chattel. Yes, the language of political expediency has certainly changed. But we see examples every day, that tell us that when it comes to obtaining social equality, we still have much work to do.

So as long as there is prejudice and bigotry towards the blind, our saying will be valid, and the need for our organization will be apparent.

What can all this possibly have to do with amateur radio? Simple. It's been my pleasure to know quite a few first-rate individuals in the amateur community since I received my ticket. I have personally met very few that I would say have a definite bias against blind persons. But as amateurs we represent a cross-section of societal thought and opinion. And some of this opinion runs contrary to the truth about blind people. When that occurs it must be addressed. And when someone asks us why we feel the way we do about things, we must tell them. You have asked, and I have told you.

Militancy like bigotry is a perceived thing. Therefore if I perceive someone's comments to be based on bigotry I will say so. And if that is perceived by others to be militant, then I acknowledge their right to their perception. Still though, my comments must stand on their own merits. I can only try to base them on facts, as I believe that I have done all along.

Understand that I dislike flame wars in the extreme. I have never participated in one and if that is where I am now I will have to deal with it. but I refuse to stand idly by while the blind are being flamed. We have enough to struggle with in society as it is, without having to deal with the sort of outdated opinion that I've seen represented by certain amateurs. This is our hobby, too. And while we will not jeoprodize others' enjoyment of the hobby, we will not sacrifice our own participation in it, either.

As for the original response to Mike Freeman's posting, I see no need to include it in future postings of mine, as I am sure that the worthy in question is adequate to the task of representing himself. We will doubtless hear from him again, and if so, you can rest assured that there will be a response.

73,

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

--

David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R # 3)
(GeNie) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

Date: 9 Jun 1993 13:45:50 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!chnews!news@ames.arpa
Subject: VE's Unnecessary?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <C8Bp5r.Apw@fc.hp.com>
perry@fc.hp.com (Perry Scott) fumes:

>: Jim Bromley, W5GYJ (jbromley@sedona.intel.com) drifts:
>: More particularly, is there any *real* reason why VE's have
>: to be licensed amateur radio operators?

>Both the FCC droid and the Advanced/Extra VE have an interest in
>maintaining the integrity of the system.

So do a lot of other people - notaries, j.p.'s, P.E.'s. Why
couldn't they administer amateur exams as well? Or any trust-
worthy U.S. resident, for that matter? The issue seems to be
that of trust, rather than any special expertise required. If
that issue could be satisfactorily resolved, the amateur licensing
procedure could be mainstreamed into flow of usual and customary
civil proceedings.

>And now, back to the topic at hand.

I changed the subject line. Hit 'k' now.

>Perry Scott, AA0ET

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 13:58:11 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!
resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <1uilnfINN41b@west.West.Sun.COM>, <C827zu.3sA@pacifier.rain.com>,
<C8BE93.Iq5@amdcl2>
Subject : Re: Bad News For Blind U.S. Hams :-(

In article <C8BE93.Iq5@amdcl2>, brian@amdcl2.amd.com (Brian McMinn) writes:
> Seems to me that the fundamental issue of blind VE's proctoring exams
> is whether blind VE's can detect cheating. This is part of a bigger

|> question regarding job related abilities. We can probably learn from
|> previous solutions:
|>
|> Women were forbidden to join the fire department for years because
|> they were considered too physically weak to carry an unconscious
|> person out of a building. This is a valid concern, AND it applies
|> to men as well. The solution was to add a job related test of
|> physical strength and to require all applicants to pass the test.
|>
|> The same is true of the VE program today. There is currently a
|> question about whether a blind person can "observe" the test session
|> and detect cheating. We should be able to come up with an appropriate
|> "skills" test for all prospective VE's. Such a test would require the
|> ability to detect cheating. The catch 22 here is that this kind of
|> test can never be objective because it requires another human subject
|> to play the "cheater" and be caught.
|>
|> Anybody want to suggest how such a test would be given? Would such a
|> test answer the needs of the FCC and of the blind hams? Is it
|> reasonable to require all VE candidates to demonstrate such skills?
|>
|> As an alternative, we could create (within the VE system) a group of
|> "authorized cheaters" who would cheat flagrantly during an exam
|> session to test the VE's ability to detect cheating. They could even
|> recruit VC's (volunteer cheaters) when their faces become too well
|> known to the VE population. Three missed cheaters in one year and the
|> VE status gets yanked. :-)
|>
|> Brian McMinn n5pss brian.mcminn@amd.com

--
While I can certainly understand the importance of such a test in the
case of a life-or-death line of work such as firefighting - such a test
to challenge the abilities of the handicapped smacks of discrimination. It
almost seems like people want to find something that they can use to validate
their discrimination.

I am not saying that Brian is prejudiced against the handicapped, just that
the able bodied should resist any temptation to create artificial barriers
for the handicapped. I work with several handicapped people - and the best
way to act is not to act - simply disregard their disability and conduct
business as usual. The handicapped know what their limitations are and most
will speak up if it becomes an issue. Look at the person, not the handicap.

A co-worker once asked me for advice. We have a co-worker in a wheelchair
and my friend wanted to know what he should do regarding the volleyball
party after work - should he invite him. I said - hell yes invite him...
it's up to him to decide how he wants to participate in group activities. He

may want to referee, watch, drink beer or play - but that's up to him, not us.

As far as amateur testing, I suppose there could be certain disadvantages if all three VE's are blind (or deaf or whatever) but the chances of that are slim. Even if all three were blind, chances are that they would realize any limitations and take actions to compensate. Amateur radio testing is not life-or-death - and if someone needs to cheat to get their ticket, they will do it one way or another. Eventually it will either catch up with them or they will actually learn ham radio. In the scheme of things, it really should not be such an issue...

++++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
++++++

Date: 9 Jun 93 14:10:11 GMT

From: ogicse!emory!gatech!ukma!rsg1.er.usgs.gov!resdgs1.er.usgs.gov!tbodoh@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C89DCo.7xq@pacifier.rain.com>, <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>, <1v36np\$e24@doc.cc.utexas.edu>
Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1v36np\$e24@doc.cc.utexas.edu>, aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

|>...
|> Let me make something clear here, if it hasn't become apparent already. I
|> might misspell the odd word here and there, but one thing that is clear is
|> my resolve, and that of a great number of blind and sighted people.
|>
|> We intend to see to it that the FCC recends its discriminatory policy. If
|> others choose to crouch in the dark caves of society's past, they may do
|> so. All that we the blind ask, is that these backward-thinking individuals
|> not waste their waining energies in ever-weakening attempts to deter us from
|> reaching our rightful goals in society's maturing modern day.
|>
|> If there are things which we can not do, we will accept that fact and go on
|> with our lives. But we refuse to be barred from attempting these things.

|> *WE* are the experts on what the blind can do, and we have the determination
|> to get it done.
|>
|> Rest assured that we *WILL* win this fight, becauuse the stakes go far beyond
|> amateur radio, and we the blind have gone far beyond the limited expectations
|> of the fearful, and bigoted few.
|> --
|> David Milner | ***** | Amateur Radio Callsign N 5 R U L (R/R #
3)
|> (GeNIE) D.MILNER | * Moo! * | (Internet) aggedor@ccwf.cc.utexas.edu
|> Austin, Tx. U.S.A. | ***** | I know who I am, and I will NEVER go back!
|> ** Illegitimus Non Carborundom Est! (Don't let the bastards get you down!) **

--
I agree.

Another thing to keep in mind is that "the handicapped" are not some seperate group in society who had the misfortune of being born that way. They are us. You could lose your sight tomorrow or become a paraplegic or quadraplegic in a traffic accident on your way home from work tonight. Honestly imagine yourself as a blind person - wouldn't your views be different if you wanted to become a VE, or maybe you were one before your accident/illness and they were now telling you you couldn't handle it anymore.

Many handicapped were once "able-bodied" - and even that term can be considered prejudiced. They are us.

+++++
+ Tom Bodoh - Sr. systems software engineer
+
+ USGS/EROS Data Center, Sioux Falls, SD, USA 57198 (605) 594-6830 +
+ Internet; bodoh@dggs.cr.usgs.gov (152.61.192.66)
+
+ "Welcome back my friends to the show that never ends!" EL&P
+
+++++

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 17:29:02 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!asuvax!ennews!enuxva.eas.asu.edu!
shandrow@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <9306060726.AA03021@hwking.cca.cr.rockwell.com>,
<C89DCo.7xq@pacifier.rain.com>, <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>
Subject : Re: blind VEs

Well, ok, technically in the dictionary the word observe might mean to watch closely but I think we've gotten past that very simple and one direction way of thinking about things. A blind person can "watch closely" just by using different techniques. No, the reader doesn't need to be certified as a ve as well. The reader is just watching the situation and reporting his/her results to the blind ve. The reader does not need to use the judgement and other skills that the ve would apply to the information received from the reader. Please revise your thinking to this century.

Date: Wed, 9 Jun 1993 16:07:23 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <C89DCo.7xq@pacifier.rain.com>, <1993Jun8.165024.22139@ke4zv.uucp>, <1v36np\$e24@doc.cc.utexas.edu>G
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: blind VEs

In article <1v36np\$e24@doc.cc.utexas.edu> aggedor@doc.cc.utexas.edu (The Monster of Peladon) writes:

>>
>Once again we see the sort of quibbling and nit-picking which has been
>the hallmark of prejudice for years. The question isn't whether the
>dictionary agrees with the words, but whether the words agree with the
>concept in the case of blind VE's. I can see that a bit of education
>is in order, although I doubt that it will do any good in certain cases,
>as minds were obviously closed to the competency of the blind long
>before this issue ever came up.

It's neither quibbling nor nitpicking to insist that words mean what they mean. The FCC requirement is unequivocal. They require their VEs to observe the testing procedure, not someone acting in the VE's stead. You can argue that observation is not a necessary function of a VE, but you can't argue that it's not now required, or that a blind person can carry out that function as it is now stated in the regulations.

>A live reader to a blind person is in some ways like an interpreter is
>to the deaf. That person is there to serve a function. If that
>function happens to be watching a testing session so that people won't
>cheat, then that is the function that will be served. In a sense the
>live reader is an extention of the blind person, and those duties can
>be performed for a blind VE with the same skill and efficiency that
>can be brought to the blind schoolteacher.

Or with the same lack of skill. The point is that it is the VE who

is certified as being competent, not the reader. Use of a reader removes that certification in the case of observation of testing sessions. The FCC has a valid concern to see that the appearance of impropriety is minimized in it's volunteer program. If that concern can be allayed, then the restriction requiring observation of testing by VEs can be relaxed. Perhaps a *combined* certification of blind amateur and reader would satisfy the concerns. This would be similar, again using driving as an analogy, to the restriction placed on drivers with impaired vision that they must wear their prescription glasses when driving. *And* that the driver's exam test the applicant with those glasses in place, and find performance suitable.

>In my lifeime I've heard all sorts of excuses supported by a legion of >tired bromides, for keeping the blind "in their place" and out of the >mainstream of activity that is puclic privalaige and duty. The excuses >have lost their validity, and their aspousers have lost their >credibility.

Sorry, I hold that measured performance is the only suitable criteria. In the case of observation, that means the ability to *watch* the testing process, with or without aids. And, like in the case of driving, any such aid must be certified to perform acceptably under those conditions.

>>>Methinks I hear echos of some of the comments about Martin Luther
>>>KIing, Jr., James Farmer, Roy Wilkins, Ralph Abernathy, W.E.B.
>>>Dubois ...
>>
>>Methinks I hear the standard cry of racism being misused in a totally
>>unrelated matter.
>Methinks *I* hear the statement of one who represents those who refuse to
>accept facts and common sense when they are *quite* evident.

If you want to warp the meaning of words to your own unique version of facts and common sense, and if you want to draw sympathy by invoking the cry of racism where it does not apply, then I must continue to protest that abuse.

>We intend to see to it that the FCC recends its discriminatory policy. If >others choose to crouch in the dark caves of society's past, they may do >so. All that we the blind ask, is that these backward-thinking individuals >not waste their waining energies in ever-weakening attempts to deter us from >reaching our rightful goals in society's maturing modern day.

The FCC, and any other licensing agency has discriminatory policies by mandate and by design. They are charged with the duty of discriminating between those who are competent and those who are incompetent to meet

the requirements of the service that they are applying to execute. Being unable to observe a testing session in a VE is no different than being unable to operate Morse code in an amateur applicant for a higher than Technician class license. It's no different than the discrimination applied to examinees by the 70% correct barrier in the written exams. It's a discrimination based on a standard of competency. It's not racist, it's not something out of caves, instead it's something altogether too rare in today's world, an insistence on demonstrated proficiency. Now we are free to disagree with the relevance of those standards, but we must make our case in a clear and rationally convincing manner, not by emotional appeals to unrelated issues of social justice.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #179
